but knowing. There is no other seer but he, there is no other hearer
but he, there is no other perceiver but he, there is no other knower hut 'he,
This is thy Self, the ruler within, the immortal."

.Thus the Antaryami Brahmana favours Absolute Monism as much as the Maitreyi Brahmana and cannot be accepted as a scriptural authority for Ramanuja's views. Yajnavalkya's condemnation, of the world as merely apparent and not real and as an evil to be avoided and the extolling of a state of absolute unity without difference, and without any desire as the final and most desirable goal of man—a doctrine which finds its fullest expression in Sankarite Vedantism—has its full and unqualified support in his remarkable exposition in the third and fourth Brahmanas of the fourth chapter of the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad. Yajnavalkya has no doubt a firm grasp of the truth that the fundamental fact of the universe is the unity of the Self in relation to which all things and beings exist. But in endeavouring to understand the true and ultimate nature of the *One,* he fails to realise that the *many* should not be left out but fully taken into account and that in manifesting Himself in the form of this infinitely variegated world the

Absolute One discloses His real nature. As observed by Tattwabhushan, Yajnavalkya. sees undoubtedly that an antithetic process, a process of differentiation is involved in grasping the Infinite. The Infinite is not the finite. It is *not* this, it is *not* that. The self is *not* what is seen,.heard, touched, smelt and tasted.' It is the seer, hearer, toucher, smeller and taster. The Rishi fails, however, to see that this differentiating process is based on relation between the finite and the Infinite, a relation which is final and indis-solvable. The Infinite is all-comprehensive. In Him^ all things and being exist for ever and nothing perishes. In the words of Tattwabhushan,

•"Yajnavalkya is wrong in disparaging the objects of the world as forms of death and in extolling an unclifferenced abstract